#6

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/669,771	Applicant(s)	Mizukami et al.	
	Examiner Christopher Bottorff		Group Art Unit 3611	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) Christopher Bottorff, Patent Examiner	(3)			<u>-</u>
(2) Mark Neblett, Attorney For Applicants	(4)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Date of Interview Jan 15, 2002	-			
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) plicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) Do. If yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed: Claim				
Identification of prior art discussed: Taurus, Subaru, and Toshihiro Ad.				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)vas reached. g) was not reached	i. h) N <u>//A</u>		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nother comments:	_		-	•
The general terminology of the classical contralized region and "concentration	aims was dis	cused,	such as "genera	ally
for describing component locations	m". The use was also dis	of more	specific ferm	inology

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i)[X] It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Christin Bitter

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.